

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In the Final Office Action dated March 3, 2009, claims 1-54 were rejected.

Claims 1, 10-13, 22-25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 54 have been amended. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 14-19, 26-29, 31-33, 36-39, 41-43, 51-53 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 8 of page 4 of the detailed action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19-20, and 22-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC 3053 (IPv6 Tunnel Broker), further in view of Waddington (Realizing the Transition to IPv6), further in view of Stevens (TCP/IP Illustrated, Volume 1: The Protocols).

Claims 1, 10-13, 22-25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 54 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Support for the amendments can be found in the paragraphs [0021], [0029], and [0030] of the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of amended claims 1, 10-13, 22-25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner asserts in paragraph 4 of page 2 that "Applicants next argue, addressing Waddington, that the 'tunnel endpoint address' are not 'the address of the desired IPv6 connect agent'; However, the specific definition Applicant appears to be relying on for an IPv6 connect agent is not required by Applicant's claim language."

As clearly defined in the amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, and 50, the IPv6 connect agent connects the IPv6 enabled node to the network containing IPv4 components. The "tunnel endpoint address" of Waddington received from the DNS server corresponds to the address of "IPv6 entity 190" shown in FIG. 1A of the present invention. Therefore, the "tunnel endpoint address" of Waddington is not the "address of the desired IPv6 connect agent" recited in the amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, and 50.

Stevens fails to disclose or suggest that "receiving, from the Domain Name System server, at least one name of an IPv6 connect agent determined by the Domain Name System server based on an identifier of the IPv6 enabled node included in the query" recited in the amended independent claim 1. In page 5 of the detailed action, the Examiner has pointed out page 2, Section 14.1, paragraph 1 showing mapping between "hostnames and IP address", and pages 13 and 15 of Stevens. However, those "hostnames and IP addresses" are hostnames and IP addresses of communication destinations targeted for a query, and correspond to hostnames and IP addresses of the "IPv6 Entities 190" shown in FIG. 1A of the present invention. The similar remarks can apply to the other independent claims 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, and 50.

Accordingly, none of the three references, alone or in combination, discloses the features of the amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, and 50. Thus, claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, and 50 are patentably distinct and Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims. Claims 6, 8, 10-12, 20-24, 34, 44, and 54 depend from independent claims 1, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, and 50, and therefore include all the limitations of the independent claims; and for at least the reasons set forth above are also patentably distinct over the art of record and in a condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowance over the cited art of record at least the above reasons and request that the Examiner allow this case.

Respectfully submitted,
HIDETOSHI YOKOTA, ET AL.

Dated: July 2, 2009

/Greg T. Sueoka/

Greg T. Sueoka, Reg. No. 33,800
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel. (650) 335-7194